

**To:** 'Thomas Haug'[THaug@wittobriens.com]; Paul.I.jones@uscg.mil[Paul.I.jones@uscg.mil]; jennifer.f.williams@uscg.mil[jennifer.f.williams@uscg.mil]; Waldon, MARGARET[Waldon.Margaret@epa.gov]; mark.crossland@wildlife.ca.gov[mark.crossland@wildlife.ca.gov]; Patrick D Hodgins[PDHodgins@paalp.com]  
**Cc:** Ryan P Andersen[RPA Andersen@paalp.com]; Connell, Michael@Wildlife[Michael.CConnell@wildlife.ca.gov]; Tre Wharton[Tre.Wharton@c-ka.com]  
**From:** Troy, Robert  
**Sent:** Wed 7/8/2015 4:38:09 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Overview Sampling Plan\_Revised

Good morning Tom and all,

Thanks for the hard work in putting this together. We can discuss further in person today, but we have a few basic comments related to the updated OOSA:

- If sampling is to begin on 7/9, this Thursday, presumably the shoreline divisions to be inspected have already been chosen. However, the text states that this selection process will incorporate local knowledge. How and when is selection and incorporation of local knowledge proposed to occur? The areas selected for survey are important and need to be well reasoned. We expect that SCAT will have a good idea of what sites need to be sampled and tested, but NRC reports and local feedback need to be incorporated into that decision making process. The sooner those conversations take place, the better.

- The document states that, with one exception, there will be only one sample taken in each Division. We don't believe that an informed decision can be made until SCAT has met with local stakeholders to receive feedback. This conversation needs to take place before a statistically valid level of testing can be determined. An arbitrary determination in advance, whether it be one or twenty, would seem to undermine that scientific process. It would seem that a final decision on the number of appropriate samples could not be made until the actual site surveys take place.

We support the RP's suggestion that, 'Fresh oil will be targeted and if more than one type of material is found, care will be taken to get rep samples of each type based on visual characteristics and location on shoreline – main point to communicate is to make sure it is clear to all teams that the target is to sample fresh oil along the shoreline that may have been recently deposited.'

- In the survey actions, there should be an additional result contemplated: inconclusive, and the proposed actions for this result should be specified.

- In the survey action where samples are consistent with Refugio Oil, the action is open ended (SCAT to determine appropriate STR). Either the action should be to clean up the entire division, or the County must be part of the decision-making process on the appropriate STR. As stated in comments regarding the pending Phase III plan, the County would like to be formally part of the SCAT process for this and Phase III.

Thanks, and look forward to further discussion.

Bob

Robert Troy

Deputy Director

Santa Barbara County Office of Emergency Management

4408 Cathedral Oaks Rd.

Santa Barbara, CA 93110

**From:** Thomas Haug [mailto:THaug@wittobriens.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 7, 2015 5:32 PM

**To:** Paul.l.jones@uscg.mil; jennifer.f.williams@uscg.mil; waldon.margaret@epa.gov; mark.crossland@wildlife.ca.gov; Troy, Robert; Patrick D Hodgins

**Cc:** Ryan P Andersen; Connell, Michael@Wildlife; Tre Wharton  
**Subject:** FW: Overview Sampling Plan\_Revised

UC, attached are several documents regarding the Overview Oiling Survey Assessment. There is a 'clean' version of the document if you want to read through the latest version. Also, there is a 'track changes' version which will allow you to see the adjustments we have made after taking the UC comments into consideration.

For the benefit of everyone we have also attached the comments received from USCG, CA DFW, SB County, and the RP (rep from C-K).

Between EUL and RP Environmental rep and myself we have taken the comments into account and feel that the OOSA document is ready for your final review and approval so we can begin this effort on **Thursday** (July 9<sup>th</sup>). If the teams are able to complete the sampling earlier than the four days which has been indicated in the OOSA, then the agencies can send their samples out sooner. As I understand it, the CA DFW sample analysis will be the primary document which will be completed with the intent of returning it first to the UC so the results can be released to the Stakeholders and Public.

Please review the appropriate document (clean or track changes) and reply with your approval if possible.

Thanks, Tom

**From:** Connell, Michael@Wildlife [<mailto:Michael.CConnell@wildlife.ca.gov>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 07, 2015 3:58 PM  
**To:** Thomas Haug  
**Subject:** Overview Sampling Plan\_Revised

Please see attached revisions to the Overview Oiling Survey Assessment. I attached a clean version and one with track changes. I also attached comments from the USCG, SB County, the RP, and the SOSC.

Please forward to the UC for review and comment.

Mike Connell

Senior Environmental Scientist

California Department of Fish & Wildlife

Office of Spill Prevention and Response

1933 Cliff Dr Suite 9

Santa Barbara, CA 93109

805 331 1867 – C

805 568 1229 – O

805 568 1235 – F

[michael.connell@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:michael.connell@wildlife.ca.gov)